



Consultant Performance Rating Request Form

PROJECT NAME

City of Sedona Public Works Department

Sedona, Arizona

DATE

102 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona Arizona 86336
(928) 204-7122 / Fax (928) 282-5348

Acknowledgement is made of Pima County, Arizona Procurement Department whose "Consultant Past Performance Evaluation Forms" was used as a base of this form.

Consultant Performance Rating Request Form

PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION



City of Sedona
102 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona Arizona 86336
(928) 204-7122 / Fax (928) 282-5348

CONSULTANT: Name of Consultant

For the **Project Name**

SEDONA, ARIZONA IS CONSIDERING THE ABOVE CONSULTANT'S APPLICATION TO PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL SERVICES TO SEDONA, ARIZONA. PLEASE RANK THE CONSULTANT'S IN THE CATEGORIES INDICATED.

PLEASE FAX THIS SHEET AND YOUR COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE TO THE FOLLOWING ON OR BEFORE DATE:

ATTENTION: DONNA PFLUEGER
City of Sedona
Public Works Department
Fax: 928-282-5348

FIRM PROVIDING REFERENCE:

NAME OF COMPANY: _____

PERSON COMPLETING REFERENCE: _____

POSITION: _____

PHONE NUMBER: _____

FAX NUMBER: _____

CITY OF SEDONA
CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE REFERENCE
PROJECT NAME

1. Name and Address of Consultant or Joint Venture	2. Total Contract Value: 3. Contract Completion Date:
4. Type of Service Provided (List name of referenced project and describe project):	
5. Ratings: After commenting, score in column on the right, using 1 for unsatisfactory, 2 for marginal, 3 for satisfactory, 4 for very good, and 5 for exceptional. (Please provide comments for a 1, 4 or 5 rating. No comment will result in revision of the rating to 2 or 3.)	
Technical Performance – Comments:	
Cost Control – Comments:	
Schedule/Timeliness – Comments:	
Community and Business Relations – Comments:	
Completeness of Original Scope of Work – Comments	
6.TOTAL SCORE: (Sum of scores from above.)	
7. Key personnel of Consultant:	
Name/Title:	Primary Responsibility:
Name/Title:	Primary Responsibility:
8. Did the consultant seem committed to customer satisfaction? __Yes __No Why?	
9. Has the consultant provided other services to the reference during the last five years? If so, using the 1 through 5 rating system, how would you generally rate their performance? Why?	

CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE RATING GUIDELINES

1. Name and Address of Consultant or Joint Venture being evaluated. Identify the specific division being evaluated if there is more than one. (Completed by Consultant prior to sending form to reference.)
2. Total Contract value, including amendments. (Completed by Consultant prior to sending form to reference.)
3. Contract completion date. State date the project was completed. Describe any issues if the work was completed beyond the original expected completion date. (Completed by Consultant prior to sending form to reference.)
4. Type of Contract. Describe the purpose/services of the overall contract. (Completed by Consultant prior to sending form to reference.)
5. In the comment area, provide rationale for the rating in accordance with the guidance attached to this Guideline. Indicate the performance rating in the far right column. (Completed by reference.)
6. Add the scores and place in this box. (Completed by reference.)
7. Identify Consultant or Joint Venture key personnel who played a major role in the performance being rated. Identify their area of primary responsibility and comment on their performance during this contract phase. Do not list personnel not employed long enough to affect performance. In some cases, more than one individual may have served in a key position. List persons that had an effect on the ratings. (Completed by Consultant prior to sending form to reference.)
8. The reference person should indicate whether the Consultant seemed to be committed to customer satisfaction. (Completed by reference.)
9. Indicate here if the Consultant has performed other work for the reference and the general quality of that work. Identification of and comment regarding projects similar to the **Project Name** are encouraged. (Completed by reference.)

CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE RATING GUIDELINES

These are suggested guidelines for assigning ratings on a consultant's compliance with the contract performance, cost, and schedule goals as specified in the Scope of Work. The rating for each category does not need to address all of the rating topics shown in the tables below.

Technical Performance (Quality of Product/Service)

Exceptional

- Met all performance requirements / Experienced/knowledgeable staff retained on project throughout rating period
- Minor problems / Highly effective corrective actions / Work and products greatly exceeded expectations
- Excellent communication with client / Prompt follow up / Effective communications with outside agencies and public bodies

Very Good

- Met all performance requirements / Most staff remained throughout rating period
- Minor problems / Effective corrective actions / Work and products above expectations
- Good communication with client / Good follow-up / Good communications with outside agencies and public bodies

Satisfactory

- Met all performance requirements / Generally stable staff
- Minor problems / Satisfactory corrective actions / Satisfactory work and products
- Follow up and communications with client, outside agencies and public bodies met expectations

Marginal

- Some performance requirements not met / Some key staff reassigned during rating period
- Performance reflects serious problem / Ineffective corrective actions / Work and products below expectations / Poor Quality Assurance/Quality Control
- Poor follow up and/or communications with client, outside agencies and public bodies

Unsatisfactory

- Most performance requirements were not met / Most key staff reassigned during rating period
- Recovery not likely / Work and products inadequate / No QA/QC evident
- Follow up and/or communications with client, outside agencies and public bodies inadequate

Cost Control

Exceptional

- Significantly reduced costs while meeting all contract requirements
- Use of internal value engineering or other innovative management techniques
- Quickly resolved cost issues / Effective corrective actions facilitated cost reductions

Very Good

- Achieved overall cost reductions while meeting all contract requirements
- Used innovative management techniques in cost control
- Quickly resolved cost/price issues / Effective corrective actions to facilitate overall cost/price reductions

Cost Control (Continued)

Satisfactory

- Met overall cost/price estimates while meeting all contract requirements

Marginal

- Do not meet cost/price estimates / Additional funds needed to complete some work
- Poor corrective action plans / No innovative techniques to bring overall expenditures within limits

Unsatisfactory

- Significant cost overruns
- Ineffective or no corrective action plan

Indicate in comments if the Consultant completed the project within the time constraints and within the proposed budget. Amendments adding to the scope of work are considered within time and budget unless a time extension was needed for consultant to finish the original scope of work.

Schedule (Timeliness)

Exceptional

- Significantly exceeded delivery schedules / Many deliverables submitted ahead of schedule
- Quickly resolved delivery issues / Highly effective corrective actions
- Communications with client and/or outside agencies anticipated and made ahead of need / Effectively communicates schedule changes
- Effectively communicates unanticipated problems and impacts on project

Very Good

- On-Time deliveries / Some deliverables submitted ahead of schedule
- Quickly resolved delivery issues / Effective corrective actions
- Some communications with client and/or outside agencies made ahead of need / Communicates schedule changes
- Communicates unanticipated problems and impacts on project

Satisfactory

- On-time deliveries / On time communications
- Minor scheduling problems / Did not effect overall schedule

Marginal

- Some late deliveries / Some communications late causing some schedule delays
- Poor corrective actions / Delays in correcting actions causing some cost impact

Unsatisfactory

- Many late deliveries / Communications inadequate and source of many delays
- Significant cost impact / Loss of capability for Client
- Ineffective or no corrective actions

CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE RATING GUIDELINES

Community and Business Relations

Exceptional

- Highly professional / Responsive / Proactive / Effective use of partnering
- Prompt and accurate invoicing/construction invoice approvals
- Early and accurate shop drawing review / Accurate submittal logs
- Minor changes made without cost impact / Limited in number / Anticipated early
- Several stakeholders commented on consultant as informed, understanding, and informative
- Consultant had good one-on-one relationships with stakeholders
- Public Information was timely and consultant could accept and respond well to input

Very Good

- Professional / Responsive / Use of partnering
- Accurate invoicing/construction invoice approvals/submittal logs
- Prompt and accurate shop drawing reviews
- Few change proposals submitted on a timely schedule
- Stakeholders generally understood consultant presentations. Little or acceptable one-on-one relationships
- Public Information was timely

Satisfactory

- Professional / Reasonably responsive
- Adequate invoicing/construction invoice approvals/submittal logs
- Timely shop drawing reviews
- Reasonable number of change proposals submitted without impact on work effort
- Public presentations informative and understandable. No one-on-one involvement

Marginal

- Less Professionalism and Responsiveness
- Low user satisfaction / No attempts to improve relations / Some subconsultant complaints
- Unnecessary change proposals / Untimely change proposal submittals
- Public presentations slightly technical for audience. No involvement individually. Provided important information to stakeholders. Incomplete response to public input

Unsatisfactory

- Delinquent responses / Lack of cooperative spirit
- Unsatisfied user / Unable to improve relations / Significant subconsultant complaints
- Change proposals to correct poor management
- Inappropriate and/or very untimely change proposals / Significant work effort impact
- Poor public presentations. Caused antagonism. Arrogant or non-responsive toward public input

Completeness of Original Scope

Exceptional

- Consultant fully anticipated scope of project
- In cases where a report was necessary to particularly define some phases of the work, the anticipated nature of the additional scope was well described
- Scope was well described without being overly sketchy or verbose
- Contract scope limitations were identified
- In hindsight, scope revisions were not due to gaps in the original scope
- The consultant's performance and deliverables were clear and the scoping meeting had no impact on these expectations
- Personnel committed were used as described in the scope and proposal
- Expectations from the owner/reference were clearly stated
- Scope was well written (content and grammatically)
- Scope negotiations proceeded easily due to the fact that first draft of scope was well-prepared and included time frames and costs
- Scope was well written (content and grammatically)

Very Good

- Scope was well written (content and grammatically)
- Scope was well described without being overly sketchy or verbose
- Personnel committed were used as described in the scope and proposal
- The scoping meeting had little impact on project expectations
- Expectations from the owner/reference were clearly stated
- First draft of scope was well prepared although some elements were missing
- Performance was well within scope expectations

Satisfactory

- Scope required little clarification as the project progressed
- Scope deliverables or performances were not as complete as the scope negotiations seemed to indicate
- The scoping meeting had little impact on project expectations
- Several iterations of scope required due to poor first draft
- Performance was within scope expectations

Marginal

- One or two items needed to be added to scope to complete the work
- Scope negotiations were prolonged due to scope clarity issues
- Some significant items and personnel identified in the proposal or qualifications statement were not used because of consultant decisions
- Performance of original scope items was barely within the scope

Unsatisfactory

- In hindsight, scope was sketchy, unclear, and significantly incomplete
- Significant disagreement regarding deliverables and performance based on scope
- Scope and proposal were significantly different due to consultant ability to perform
- Scope negotiations unduly difficult